MINUTES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF YORK

Adjourned Meeting August 13, 2002

6:00 p.m.

<u>Meeting Convened</u>. An Adjourned Meeting of the York County Board of Supervisors was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, August 13, 2002, in the East Room, York Hall, by Chairman Donald E. Wiggins.

<u>Attendance</u>. The following members of the Board of Supervisors were present: Sheila S. Noll, Donald E. Wiggins, James S. Burgett, and Thomas G. Shepperd.

Also in attendance was James O. McReynolds, County Administrator.

Walter C. Zaremba was absent.

REVISED SECONDARY ROAD PLAN

Mr. John Mazur, Assistant Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Transportations, appeared to discuss VDOT's fund allocations, cash management, and road projects. He highlighted some of the major changes in the Secondary Six-Year Plan projects and explained that he was directed to go back over the existing projects to adjust funding. He pointed out that the projects most impacted were those low on the priority list.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> addressed the 37.9 percent difference between the previous projected allocations as opposed to the revised projected allocations, asking how far back VDOT went on the revised allocations.

Mr. Mazur explained the 37.9 percent was based on last year's numbers, and what was already funded for 2000-2001 remained the same. He stated these changes were based on the program adopted by the Board of Supervisors last December.

Mrs. Noll asked if all localities in Virginia had been hit by the same percentage reduction.

 $\underline{\text{Mr. Mazur}}$ stated that most localities were in the 30-35 percent range. He explained how the costs were applied towards the projects, and he discussed the cost overruns. He elaborated on some of the other problems VDOT may encounter.

<u>Mr. Shepperd</u> questioned the increased cost of \$7 million and the reduction of 37.9 percent, meaning more was actually given up because the cost factor had gone up for the materials. He remarked that if the \$7 million in cost increases was not incorporated into the 37.9 percent, the figure was actually more than the stated 37.9 percent.

<u>Mr. Mazur</u> indicated he had received cost estimates and some of the projects increased significantly in the overall cost of construction. He stated he would be talking to the designers to make sure the estimates are accurate. He explained the extra money left over at the end of a project would be transferred to other projects in York County's Six-Year Plan. Mr. Mazur reported that VDOT wanted to provide a realistic Six-Year Plan within the budget.

Mrs. Noll asked if any of York's projects were under budget.

<u>Mr. Mazur</u> pointed out that some of the projects were over and some were under. The projects that had extra money left were used to pay off some of the deficits. He indicated he would provide the over and under funding on the projects once reconciliation has been completed.

Mr. Burgett asked when the public hearing would take place for Lakeside Drive, and he inquired about the status of the intersections of Big Bethel Road and Routes 134 and 171.

Mr. Mazur stated the public hearing on the Lakeside Drive project would be in September. He noted he had spoken with to the designer of the Big Bethel Road project, but no specific reasons were given why the project costs have increased. He stated the ad date for that project is slated for December, 2003.

Mr. Burgett inquired about the Fort Eustis Boulevard project.

Mr. Mazur reported the project would be advertised in April, 2004.

Mr. Shepperd asked if the work at Route 134 and Route 171 had been rescheduled.

Mr. J. Mark Carter, Planning and Zoning Manager, explained that some mention had been made in the primary priorities, but all of the work would occur within the Secondary Road System.

Mrs. Noll questioned the increased cost of Water Country Parkway.

Mr. Mazur stated he also felt the project cost estimate was substantially high, and he had spoken with the designer who assured him the estimate was accurate.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> mentioned that the shoulders on Seaford Road needed to be widened because it was a dangerous road with heavy traffic. He described how the residents have a difficult time getting mail from their mailboxes on such a narrow road with heavy traffic.

Mr. Mazur stated that VDOT was always willing work with the County on the prioritization of road projects. He reported that the cost of Penniman Road had gone up to \$2.25 million, resulting in the Water Country Parkway project being pushed back. He stated he would double-check the project's estimates.

Mr. Shepperd noted the priorities were not the same since the money was not available.

Mr. Mazur suggested the Board review the projects to decide if it would like to scale back one project to accelerate another.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> asked that the Grafton Drive project be re-evaluated since it helps to eliminate traffic on Route 17.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> suggested that staff work with VDOT to clarify the latest information and to review the priorities the Board had previously approved. He stated he would have the staff work on the cost analysis to determine the benefit of a project.

<u>Mrs. Noll</u> recommended that the traffic patterns be studied to select the best traffic system for the money available.

<u>Mr. Mazur</u> stated he was instructed to remove any project from the Six-Year Plan that had not had any money allocated, or that will not have any money allocated within six years. He explained that the last phase of the Grafton Drive/Burts Road project did not have any prior or allocated money, so it was removed from the schedule.

PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> explained that each year staff performs a review of the personnel policies and procedures to identify any changes that may be needed. He noted the proposed manual did not have any significant policy changes at this time, only minor changes for clarification purposes.

Mr. Shepperd asked Mr. McReynolds if anything in the policy was cause for concern.

Mr. McReynolds answered that the polices were sound and had been proven over time.

By consensus, the Board made no further changes to the Personnel Policies and Procedures for FY03.

BOARD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> explained that the Board Policies and Procedures were reviewed yearly and that there were no substantial changes, other than changes recommended in the Parks and Recreation fees. He advised that the Use of County Buildings Policy had been reviewed extensively, and noted changes were recommended to clarify and put the County in a better position to administer those regulations for use of its facilities.

Mr. Burgett asked who sets the rules for the use of the room in the library.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> responded that the Library Board scheduled the room and established the procedures; he stated they have agreed to follow the Board's procedures.

<u>Mrs. Noll</u> advised there were a few things added that she felt shouldn't be included. She asked how the County would know if an applicant was legally competent to reserve the room.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> explained that the changes were recommended by the County Attorney to clarify the policy, and to put him in a better position to defend the policy should a reservation be questioned.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> mentioned the proposed elimination of public groups meeting in the Public Safety Meeting Room.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> explained there were times when a conflict had occurred and the Sheriff's office or the Department of Fire & Life Safety needed the room. The four outside groups have agreed to new meeting locations.

Mr. Burgett inquired about the mobile stage and the fees for the use of the stage and where it may be used.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> responded that other local governmental units have been the primary users of the stage and elaborated on the fees to cover the transportation costs.

Mr. Burgett questioned the paragraph regarding the Sheriff's vehicles being driven home.

Mr. McReynolds pointed out that the patrol cars parked in the neighborhoods deterred crime which benefited the citizens.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> advised that staff would prepare a resolution to approve the policies and their changes. He then reminded the Board of its next regularly scheduled meeting on August 20, and noted he would be out of town the following Thursday and Friday.

Meeting Adjourned At 6:56 p.m. Chairman Wiggins declared the meeting adjourned sine die.

James O. McReynolds, Clerk

York County Board of Supervisors

Donald E. Wiggins, Chairman

York County Board of Supervisors